

Remarks

Claims 1-28 are pending in the application, and stand rejected.

Claim rejections

Claims 1-5, 17, 21 and 25-28 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tayloe et al. ("Tayloe") (US 6,192,240 B1) in view of Bartle (US 6,018,666). The Applicant respectfully traverses. The cited references do not support the asserted rejection for at least the reason that they do not disclose or suggest "wherein a prediction point is separated from an interruption point by a first predetermined time or distance interval, and a second predetermined time or distance interval between the interruption point and a connectivity point defines a no-coverage zone, the communication being capable of being re-established at or beyond the connectivity point outside the no-coverage zone," as recited in independent claims 1, 21, 25, 26 and 28. Accordingly, the claims are allowable over Tayloe and Bartle. Withdrawal of the asserted rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 10-16, 18-20 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tayloe in view of Bartle, and further in view of Amin et al. (US 5,995,830) ("Amin"). These claims depend on one of independent claims 1 and 21, and are therefore allowable over Tayloe and Bartle for at least the reasons discussed above. Amin does not cure the deficiencies in Tayloe and Bartle, and therefore the claims are further allowable over the cited combination. Withdrawal of the asserted rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

A basis for rejection of claims 4 and 5 is not explicitly cited in the current Office Action (see page 13, 2nd paragraph). However, Tayloe and Bartle are discussed in connection with claims 4 and 5. Along lines discussed above, since they depend on claim 1, claims 4 and 5 are allowable over Tayloe and Bartle for at least the reasons discussed in connection with claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4 and 5 is respectfully requested.

Claims 6-9 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tayloe in view of Bartle, and further in view of Elwin (US 6,317,596). Claims 6-9 depend on claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least that reason over Tayloe and Bartle. Elwin does not cure deficiencies in the latter and therefore claims 6-9 are further allowable over Elwin. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6-9 as being unpatentable over Tayloe, Bartle and Elwin is therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In light of the above discussion, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in all aspects in allowable condition, and earnestly solicits favorable reconsideration and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4323 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is authorized to charge any fees related to this communication to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: JUNE 12, 2006

By:


William E. Curry
Reg. No. 43,572

KENYON & KENYON LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 220-4200
Fax:(202) 220-4201